Exhibit C

Case 3:19-cv-05711-EMC Document 80-3 Filed 05/21/21 Page 2 of 10 Fred Heidarpour - March 3, 2021

```
1
                           UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2.
                         NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 3
 4
          ABANTE ROOTER AND PLUMBING,
                                         )
          INC., a California
                                         )
 5
          corporation, individually
                                         )
          and on behalf of all others
          similarly situated,
 6
                                         )No. 3:19-CV-05711
                                         )
 7
                      Plaintiff,
                                         )
 8
                 VS.
 9
          TOTAL MERCHANT SERVICES,
          LLC, a Delaware limited
10
          liability company,
11
                      Defendant.
12
13
14
                           REMOTE VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION
15
                                         OF
16
                                  FRED HEIDARPOUR
                            Wednesday, March 3rd, 2021
17
                                 Orinda, California
18
19
20
21
22
23
2.4
25
          Reported by: Janie E. Wilkins, CSR No. 12497
                                                    Page 1
```

1		APPEARANCES
2		
3		
4		
5	For Plaintiff:	Woodrow & Peluso, LLC
		BY MR. TAYLOR SMITH
6		Attorney at Law
		3900 East Mexico Avenue
7		Suite 300
		Denver, Colorado 80210
8		(720) 213-0675
		tsmith@woodrowpeluso.com
9		
10		_
11		Greenspoon Marder, LLP
	Merchant Services:	
12		Attorney at Law
1 0		200 East Broward Boulevard
13		Site 1800
1 /		Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301
14		(954) 527-2427
15		lawren.zann@gmlaw.com
16		
17		
18		
19		
20	The Videographer:	Terri Perkins
21	ine videographer	
22		
23		
24		
25		
		Page 2
		Page 2

	Г		
1		I N D E X	
2			
3	EXAMINATION B	Y	PAGE
4	MR. ZANN		6
5	MR. SMITH		288
6	MR. ZANN (Fur	ther)	290
7			
8			
9		EXHIBIT INDEX	
10	Defendant's E	xhibits	
11	Exhibit 1 N	otice of Deposition	33
12	Exhibit 2 C	omplaint	72
13	Exhibit 3 E	-mails from Aleks Meza	94
14	Exhibit 4 E	-mail from Leutrim Ismajli	96
15	Exhibit 5 E	-mail Communication	99
16	Exhibit 6 P	laintiff's Objection and Response	116
	t	o Defendant's Interrogatories	
17			
	Exhibit 7 P	laintiff's Supplemental Objection	118
18	a	nd Responses to Defendant's	
	I	nterrogatories	
19			
	Exhibit 8 P	laintiff's Second Supplemental	120
20	0	bjections and Responses	
21	Exhibit 9 P	rintout of Website	194
22	Exhibit 10 P	hone bill for 10/20/18	229
23	Exhibit 11 P	hone bill for 4/19/19	229
24	Exhibit 12 D	ocument entitled AT&T Your	229
	d	etailed usage	
25			
		Pag	e 3

1	
	I N D E X (Continued)
2	
3	
	EXHIBIT INDEX
4	Defendant's Exhibits
5	Exhibit 13 Document with AT&T Cycle Date 229
	of 10/20/18
6	
	Exhibit 14 Retainer Agreement 277
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	WITNESS INSTRUCTED NOT TO ANSWER:
14	Page 26, Line 3
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	Page 4

1	Q. And you had used the date 2017. Is there a	09:27:51
2	reason why you used a time frame of 2015 to 2017 when	09:27:54
3	discussing Andrew?	09:27:58
4	A. I started to get a call, tons of calls, and	09:27:59
5	that's what I'm saying is that's what I believe it	09:28:03
6	was in 2017 that we thought that we resolved the	09:28:05
7	issue by not calling us. And we got a I believe	09:28:10
8	we got an e-mail from counsel, from TMS that it it	09:28:13
9	looked like it's a promissory; that they're not going	09:28:17
10	to call you again, and we instructed them. All of us	09:28:21
11	thought that's what is said; that we thought that we	09:28:25
12	put it to bed, that's the end of it, but,	09:28:28
13	unfortunately, it didn't happen.	09:28:31
14	Q. So just using that as a point of reference,	09:28:33
15	that time period in approximately 2017 when to use	09:28:36
16	your term you put the issue to bed, from that time	09:28:41
17	forward, have you communicated with Andrew concerning	09:28:45
18	TMS?	09:28:47
19	A. I don't recall.	09:28:48
20	Q. Okay. As it relates to well, let me ask	09:28:51
21	you this: Has Andrew represented Abante in any of	09:28:56
22	its legal proceedings?	09:29:00
23	A. I don't think so.	09:29:02
24	Q. So as you sit here today, you don't	09:29:05
25	recall Abante does not recall retaining your son,	09:29:08
	I	Page 29

1	Q. Fast-forward two years to March 22nd, 2019,	10:39:08
2	you state you receive a call that you believe was	10:39:13
3	directly placed by TMS; correct?	10:39:16
4	A. Actually, the original was in 2018; was	10:39:21
5	not 2019.	10:39:24
6	Q. Okay. But your testimony when I had asked	10:39:25
7	you originally if you believe TMS directly called	10:39:29
8	you, you stated "yes." I asked you what's the basis	10:39:32
9	for that belief. You provided two bases. A	10:39:35
10	prerecorded call as well as an e-mail. And then I	10:39:38
11	stated, "When did the prerecorded call occur?" And	10:39:42
12	you told me, "After looking at your complaint that	10:39:45
13	you believe it was March 22nd, 2019"; correct?	10:39:47
14	A. That is correct.	10:39:51
15	Q. And that's where we are. And that's why	10:39:52
16	we're focused on March 22nd, 2019.	10:39:54
17	Now you've just stated something occurred	10:39:57
18	back in 2018. Was that a prerecorded call that	10:39:59
19	occurred in 2018?	10:40:02
20	A. No, sir. That was the ATDS call that	10:40:04
21	happened on 2018.	10:40:08
22	Q. We'll get to that one soon. But staying	10:40:09
23	focused on the task at hand we're focused on the	10:40:11
24	prerecorded telephone call that you just stated. And	10:40:14
25	you stated that occurred on March 22nd, 2019. Then	10:40:16
	F	Page 82

1	A. Again, when I when I'm not available, she	13:55:55
2	writes it probably on my notes. I don't know.	13:55:59
3	Q. And I appreciate that when you're not	13:56:02
4	available that she steps in, but my question to you	13:56:04
5	is do you recall discussing notes or the telephone	13:56:08
6	call that preceded the sending of this e-mail with	13:56:11
7	your wife?	13:56:13
8	A. It must be. I don't know. That's we	13:56:14
9	are 24/7 together. How can I remember the	13:56:17
10	conversation that we had three years ago?	13:56:21
11	Q. I don't know if you do or don't. That's why	13:56:23
12	I'm asking you the question.	13:56:25
13	A. I don't know.	13:56:27
14	Q. Okay. So you don't know if you communicated	13:56:27
15	with her. Did you ever review the complaint prior to	13:56:29
16	it being filed?	13:56:32
17	A. Yes.	13:56:34
18	Q. And did you review the interrogatories prior	13:56:35
19	to signing the verification pages we discussed	13:56:38
20	earlier?	13:56:41
21	A. Yes.	13:56:42
22	Q. So at any point in time in reviewing the	13:56:43
23	complaint or the interrogatory responses as it	13:56:45
24	relates to the alleged call that occurred	13:56:48
25	on June 24th, 2019, did you communicate with your	13:56:51
	Pa	ge 184

1	of stopping the telemarketers, in this case you would	14:35:09
2	agree that you did not sue Triumph Merchant	14:35:14
3	Solutions, LLC; correct?	14:35:20
4	A. Whatever the complaints if the complaints	14:35:20
5	is not, it's not.	14:35:23
6	Q. We can pull up the complaint if we want	14:35:24
7	because that's Exhibit 2. But I would assume you	14:35:27
8	know who you sued. Do you know who you sued in this	14:35:29
9	litigation?	14:35:32
10	A. Yes. Total Merchant Services.	14:35:33
11	Q. So you would agree that you did not sue	14:35:35
12	Triumph Merchant Solutions, LLC; correct?	14:35:37
13	A. Because every every information that we	14:35:40
14	got from Triumph was under the Total Merchant	14:35:42
15	Services.	14:35:47
16	Q. I understand that. You've testified to that	14:35:47
17	earlier. But my question to you is just having you	14:35:49
18	confirm, what I think is obvious, which is you did	14:35:51
19	not sue Triumph Merchant Solutions, LLC; correct?	14:35:53
20	A. Right.	14:35:57
21	Q. The actual entity who placed the telephone	14:35:57
22	call; correct?	14:36:00
23	A. On behalf of TMS, yes.	14:36:01
24	Q. And neither did you sue Christopher Judy;	14:36:03
25	correct?	14:36:06
	Pa	ge 217

1	A. Right.	14:36:08
2	Q. So the actual telemarketers who placed the	14:36:08
3	call, for whatever reason, you elected not to sue;	14:36:12
4	correct?	14:36:15
5	A. They were working on behalf of TMS.	14:36:15
6	Q. Well, that's what you're alleging, but	14:36:18
7	my	14:36:21
8	A. That's what the document shows.	14:36:21
9	Q. My question to you, though, is just having	14:36:23
10	you confirm that you chose, for whatever reason, not	14:36:27
11	to sue the actual entities that placed the telephone	14:36:31
12	call; correct?	14:36:35
13	A. Right. Correct. Because they were working	14:36:36
14	on behalf of TMS.	14:36:38
15	Q. So when it comes to stopping the	14:36:41
16	telemarketers, you're not actually taking action	14:36:42
17	against the people calling you; right?	14:36:46
18	A. No, Lawren, that's that's not a true	14:36:51
19	statement. The people that are calling are working	14:36:53
20	on behalf of Total Merchant Services.	14:36:56
21	Q. So by suing Total Merchant Services, do you	14:36:59
22	think that is a detriment to Triumph from placing	14:37:03
23	telephone calls in the future?	14:37:07
24	A. Definitely because according to Todd	14:37:09
25	Anderson, he said that he's going to tell the Total	14:37:13
	Ра	age 218